

ARMY BOARD FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IN THE CASE OF: [REDACTED]

BOARD DATE: 5 March 2025

DOCKET NUMBER: AR20240009407

APPLICANT REQUESTS:

- an upgrade of his under other than honorable conditions discharge
- a personal appearance before the Board

APPLICANT'S SUPPORTING DOCUMENT(S) CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:

DD Form 149 (Application for Correction of Military Record).

FACTS:

1. The applicant did not file within the 3-year time frame provided in Title 10, U.S. Code, section 1552(b); however, the Army Board for Correction of Military Records (ABCMR) conducted a substantive review of this case and determined it is in the interest of justice to excuse the applicant's failure to timely file.
2. The applicant states he would like his under other than honorable discharge changed, if possible. He believes the correction should be made because since his discharge in 2002, he has worked for the U.S. Armed Forces and is currently contracted with the U.S. Armed Forces. Additionally, he has never had a criminal record.
3. A review of the applicant's service record shows:
 - a. He enlisted in the Regular Army on 13 August 1999.
 - b. On 7 June 2002, court-martial charges were preferred on the applicant for:
 - one specification of stealing a Guess watch on or about 31 October 2001, of a value of less than \$500.00, the property of Specialist RP
 - two specifications of unlawfully breaking and entering the barracks room of Specialist RP and Sergeant WC with intent to commit larceny on 31 October 2001

c. On 10 June 2002, the applicant consulted with legal counsel and requested a discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial under the provisions of Army Regulation (AR) 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), Chapter 10. The applicant's rank was listed as private first class (PFC)/E-3. He acknowledged:

- he was making the request of his own free will
- maximum punishment
- he was guilty of at least one or more of the charges against him or of a lesser included offense
- he does not desire further rehabilitation or further military service
- if his request for discharge was accepted, he may be discharged under other conditions other than honorable
- he would be deprived of many or all Army benefits, he may be ineligible for many, or all benefits administered by the Veterans Administration,
- he may be deprived of his rights and benefits as a Veteran under both Federal and State law
- he must apply to the Army Discharge Review Board or the Army Board for the Correction of Military Records for a review of discharge, but there was no automatic upgrading
- he may expect to encounter substantial prejudice in civilian life

d. On 13 June 2002, the separation authority approved the applicant's request for discharge in lieu of trial by court-martial. He would be issued an Under Other Than Honorable Conditions Discharge Certificate and reduced to the lowest enlisted grade.

e. On 28 June 2002, he was discharged from active duty with an under other than honorable conditions characterization of service. His DD Form 214 (Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty) shows he completed 2 year 5 months of active service.

4. By regulation (AR 15-185), an applicant is not entitled to a hearing before the ABCMR. Hearings may be authorized by a panel of the ABCMR or by the Director of the ABCMR.

5. By regulation (AR 635-200), an individual who has committed an offense or offenses, the punishment for which, includes a bad conduct or dishonorable discharge, may submit a request for discharge for the good of the service. An Under Other than Honorable Discharge Certificate normally is appropriate for a member who is discharged for the good of the service or in lieu of trial by court-martial.

6. In reaching its determination, the Board can consider the applicant's petition and his service record in accordance with the published equity, injustice, or clemency determination guidance.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

1. After reviewing the application, all supporting documents, and the evidence found within the military record, the Board found that relief was not warranted. The Board carefully considered the applicant's record of service, documents submitted in support of the petition and executed a comprehensive and standard review based on law, policy and regulation, and published Department of Defense guidance for liberal and clemency determinations requests for upgrade of his characterization of service. Upon review of the applicant's petition and available military records, The Board took note of the applicant's contentions that since his separation in 2002, he has maintained a clean criminal record and has continued to serve the U.S. Armed Forces in a civilian capacity, including his current role as a contractor. He believes these post-service contributions warrant a correction to his discharge status.

2. However, the Board determined that there is insufficient evidence of in-service mitigating factors to outweigh the seriousness of the applicant's misconduct, which included multiple offenses such as theft and unlawful entry with intent to commit larceny. While the Board acknowledged and commends the applicant's post-service conduct, including his continued support of the Armed Forces in a civilian capacity, these achievements do not negate the gravity of the offenses committed during his military service. The Board found that the characterization of service he received was appropriate based on the nature of the misconduct and the circumstances surrounding his discharge. Therefore, the applicant has not demonstrated by a preponderance of evidence that an error or injustice occurred, and his request for an upgrade of the under other than honorable conditions (UOTHC) discharge. Therefore, the Board denied relief.

BOARD VOTE:

<u>Mbr 1</u>	<u>Mbr 2</u>	<u>Mbr 3</u>	
:	:	:	GRANT FULL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT PARTIAL RELIEF
:	:	:	GRANT FORMAL HEARING
XXX	XXX	XXX	DENY APPLICATION

BOARD DETERMINATION/RECOMMENDATION:

The evidence presented does not demonstrate the existence of a probable error or injustice. Therefore, the Board determined the overall merits of this case are insufficient as a basis for correction of the records of the individual concerned.

X //SIGNED//

CHAIRPERSON

I certify that herein is recorded the true and complete record of the proceedings of the Army Board for Correction of Military Records in this case.

REFERENCES:

1. Title 10, U.S. Code, section 1552(b), provides that applications for correction of military records must be filed within 3 years after discovery of the alleged error or injustice. This provision of law also allows the ABCMR to excuse an applicant's failure to timely file within the 3-year statute of limitations if the ABCMR determines it would be in the interest of justice to do so.
2. Army Regulation 15-185 (ABCMR) prescribes the policies and procedures for correction of military records by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the ABCMR. The ABCMR begins its consideration of each case with the presumption of administrative regularity, which is that what the Army did was correct.
 - a. The ABCMR is not an investigative body and decides cases based on the evidence that is presented in the military records provided and the independent evidence submitted with the application. The applicant has the burden of proving an error or injustice by a preponderance of the evidence.
 - b. The ABCMR may, in its discretion, hold a hearing or request additional evidence or opinions. Additionally, it states in paragraph 2-11 that applicants do not have a right to a hearing before the ABCMR. The Director or the ABCMR may grant a formal hearing whenever justice requires.

3. Army Regulation 635-5 (Separation Documents, in effect at the time, states the DD Form 214 is a summary of the Soldier's most recent period of continuous active duty. It provides a brief, clear-cut record of all current active, prior active, and prior inactive duty service at the time of release from active duty, retirement, or discharge. The information entered thereon reflects the conditions as they existed at the time of separation.

4. Army Regulation 635-200 (Personnel Separations – Enlisted Personnel), in effect at the time, sets forth the basic authority for the separation of enlisted personnel.

a. Paragraph 3-7a (Honorable Discharge) states an honorable discharge is a separation with honor. The honorable characterization is appropriate when the quality of the member's service generally has met, the standards of acceptable conduct and performance of duty for Army personnel, or is otherwise so meritorious that any other characterization would be clearly inappropriate.

b. Paragraph 3-7b (General Discharge) states a general discharge is a separation from the Army under honorable conditions. When authorized, it is issued to a member whose military record is satisfactory but not sufficiently meritorious to warrant an honorable discharge.

c. Chapter 10 of this regulation states an individual who has committed an offense or offenses, the punishment for any of which includes a bad conduct discharge or dishonorable discharge, may submit a request for discharge for the good of the service. An Under Other than Honorable Discharge Certificate normally is appropriate for a member who is discharged for the good of the service.

5. On 25 July 2018, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issued guidance to Military Discharge Review Boards and Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records (BCM/NRs) regarding equity, injustice, or clemency determinations. Clemency generally refers to relief specifically granted from a criminal sentence. BCM/NRs may grant clemency regardless of the type of court-martial. However, the guidance applies to more than clemency from a sentencing in a court-martial; it also applies to other corrections, including changes in a discharge, which may be warranted based on equity or relief from injustice.

a. This guidance does not mandate relief, but rather provides standards and principles to guide Boards in application of their equitable relief authority. In determining whether to grant relief based on equity, injustice, or clemency grounds, BCM/NRs shall consider the prospect for rehabilitation, external evidence, sworn testimony, policy changes, relative severity of misconduct, mental and behavioral health conditions, official governmental acknowledgement that a relevant error or injustice was committed, and uniformity of punishment.

b. Changes to the narrative reason for discharge and/or an upgraded character of service granted solely on equity, injustice, or clemency grounds normally should not result in separation pay, retroactive promotions, and payment of past medical expenses or similar benefits that might have been received if the original discharge had been for the revised reason or had the upgraded service characterization.

//NOTHING FOLLOWS//